

State of Utah

Department of Natural Resources

> MICHAEL R. STYLER Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

JOHN R. BAZA Division Director JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR. Governor

GARY R. HERBERT Lieutenant Governor

July 11, 2005

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT 7002 0510 0003 8603 3400

Lon Thomas Star Stone Quarries, Inc. 4040 South 300 West Salt Lake City, Utah 84107

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Cessation Order No. MC-05-01-04(1) and State Violation No. MN-05-01-05(1), Star Stone Quarries, Inc., Heber Quarry (M/051/001), Wasatch County, Utah

Dear Mr. Thomas:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R647-7.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced cessation order and Notice of Violation. The cessation order and violation were issued by Division Inspector, Lynn Kunzler, on June 10, 2005. Rule R647-7-103 et. seq. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty for the violations as follows:

- MC-05-01-04(1)– Violation 1 of 1 \$1980
- MN-05-01-05(1)- Violation 1 of 1 \$ 418

The enclosed worksheet specifically outlines how the violation was assessed.

By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Cessation Order or Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty. If the violation has not been abated at the time of the proposed assessment, the assignment of good faith points cannot be made. If you feel that you are eligible for good faith, you should supply relevant information to the assessment officer within 15 days of the violation abatement date so that it can be factored into the final assessment.



Lon Thomas Page 2 of 6 M/051/001 July 11, 2005

Otherwise, under R647-7-106, there are two informal appeal options available to you:

- 1. If you wish to informally appeal the <u>fact of the Cessation Order or fact of the Violation</u>, you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. This conference will be conducted by the Division Director or Associate Director. This Informal Conference is distinct from the Assessment Conference regarding the proposed penalty.
- 2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. If you are also requesting a review of the fact of violation, as noted in paragraph one, the assessment conference will be scheduled immediately following that review.

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of the cessation order and the fact of the violation will stand, the proposed penalty(ies) will become final, and the penalty(ies) will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the final assessment. Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Vickie Southwick.

Sincerely,

Jusan M. Hite Daron R. Haddock Assessment Officer

Enclosure: Worksheets

cc: Vickie Southwick, Exec. Sec. Vicki Bailey, Accounting

O:\M051-Wasatch\M0510001-heber-quarry\non-compliance\proAssessment-CONOV.doc

# WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING Minerals Regulatory Program

			E <u>Star Stone Quarr</u> -05-01-04(1)	ies, Inc. /Heber Quarry PERI VIOLATIO	MIT <u>S/051/001</u> ON <u>1</u> of <u>1</u>	
ASSI	ESSME	ENT DA	TE July 8, 200	05		
ASSI	ESSME	ENT OF	FICER Daron R.	Haddock		
I.	HIST	HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.11)				
	A.	A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall within three (3) years of today's date?				
	PRE	VIOUS	VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)	
		none				
II.		TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0  SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647–7-103.2.12)				
	NOT	E:	For assignment of	f points in Parts II and III, the	following apply:	
				Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will letermine within each category where the violation falls.		
		2.		mid-point of the category, the up or down, utilizing the inspeding documents.		
			is an EVENT (A) or gn points according	Administrative (B) violation? to A or B)	Event	
	A. <u>EVENT VIOLATION</u> (Max 45 pts.)					
		1.	What is the event	which the violated standard w	vas designed to prevent?	

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

<b>PROBABILITY</b>	RANGE
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

## ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 20

#### PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* An Operator is required to obtain a permit from the Division of Oil Gas and Mining prior to conducting mining operations. Acreage has been disturbed at this location without revising the permit to do so. While the Operator has a permit for a large mine, which allowed disturbance up to a certain area, the operation has expanded onto lands which he does not own or control (approximately 0.5 acres). Disturbance has actually occurred.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

## ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 8

#### PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* The inspector stated that the operator has disturbed approximately .75 acres of land that had not been approved for disturbance. The damage was the loss of resources and soil on the area disturbed. Further discussion with the inspector revealed that the damage is probably temporary. While much of the soil and vegetation have been buried by overburden or scraped from the site of disturbance, the site could still be reclaimed. Damage is accessed in the lower 1/3 of the range.

# B. ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS (Max 25pts)

1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement?

RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS \_\_\_\_\_

# PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\*

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 28

## III. <u>DEGREE OF FAULT</u> (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)

A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, the failure to abate any violation due to the same or was economic gain realized by the permittee? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence 0
Negligence 1-15
Greater Degree of Fault 16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 10

#### PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* The inspector indicated that the operator had previously been cautioned about the need to remain within the permit area. Permit Area markers had been installed, but were not closely monitored and some of them had been moved from their original setting. This indicates indifference to the rules or lack of reasonable care. A prudent operator would understand the need to keep within the approved boundaries and provide a revised NOI prior to disturbing additional area. The Operator was negligent in this regard, thus the assignment of points in the middle part of the negligence range.

# IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

• Immediate Compliance -11 to -20\*
(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

• Rapid Compliance -1 to -10

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

• Normal Compliance 0

(Operator complied within the abatement period required) (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

- \*Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.
- B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

- Rapid Compliance -11 to -20\*
  (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)
- Normal Compliance -1 to -10\*

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

• Extended Compliance 0

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Difficult

## ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

## PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* The abatement has not yet been completed, so good faith points cannot be awarded at this time. This category will be looked at again after the abatement has been completed. Points will be awarded depending on how quickly the abatement is met.

# V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)

NOT	TCE OF VIOLATION # <u>MC-05-01-</u>	04(1)
I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	0
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	28
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	10
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	38
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$ 1,980

# WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING Minerals Regulatory Program

COM	IPANY / MI	NE Star Stone Quarr	ies, Inc. /Heber Quarry PERM	MIT <u>M/051/001</u>	
NOV	/ CO # <u>M</u>	IC-05-01-05(1)	VIOLATIO	ON <u>1</u> of <u>1</u>	
ASSI	ESSMENT I	DATEJuly 8, 200	05		
ASSI	ESSMENT (	OFFICER <u>Daron R.</u>	Haddock		
I.	HISTOR	<u>HISTORY</u> (Max. 25 pts.) (R647–7-103.2.11)			
	A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall within three (3) years of today's date?				
	PREVIOU	JS VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)	
	no	ne			
п.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 0  SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647-7-103.2.12)				
	NOTE:	For assignment of	For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply:		
	1.		Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.		
	2.		mid-point of the category, the Aup or down, utilizing the inspecting documents.		
	Is this an EVENT (A) or (assign points according		Administrative (B) violation? to A or B)	Event	
	A. <u>EVENT VIOLATION</u> (Max 45 pts.)				
	1.	What is the event	which the violated standard w	as designed to prevent?	

2.	What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violate standard was designed to prevent?	d
	DRODADU ITV. DANGE	

PROBABILITY	RANGE	
None	0	
Unlikely	1-9	
Likely	10-19	
Occurred	20	

## ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 9

#### PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* There is potential for environmental harm and water pollution to occur as a result of untreated runoff leaving the site. Currently runoff is contained along the highway borrow pit. It would take a large runoff event for water to overflow the highway and enter into the creek. It is not very likely that this would occur. Because of the potential for damage points are assigned in the upper part of the Unlikely range.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 0

## PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* The inspector stated that no damage has occurred. There is only the potential for damage.

- B. <u>ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS</u> (Max 25pts)
  - 1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement?

RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS \_\_\_\_\_

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\*

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 9

## III. DEGREE OF FAULT (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)

A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, the failure to abate any violation due to the same or was economic gain realized by the permittee? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence 0
Negligence 1-15
Greater Degree of Fault 16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Negligence

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 10

## PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* Permit Condition "E" required the operator use sediment control measures as determined by the Division. The operator has dumped soil materials which blocked the inlet to the required catchment basin. This indicates indifference to the rules or lack of reasonable care. A prudent operator would understand the need to keep the sediment controls functioning. The Operator was negligent in this regard, thus the assignment of points in the middle part of the negligence range.

# V. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

• Immediate Compliance -11 to -20\*

(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

• Rapid Compliance -1 to -10

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

• Normal Compliance 0

(Operator complied within the abatement period required) (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

<sup>\*</sup>Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

• Rapid Compliance -11 to -20\*

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

• Normal Compliance -1 to -10\*

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

Extended Compliance

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Easy

## ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 0

#### PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

\*\*\* The abatement has not yet been completed, so good faith points cannot be awarded at this time. This category will be looked at again after the abatement has been completed. Points will be awarded depending on how quickly the abatement is met.

## V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)

NOT	ICE OF VIOLATION # MC-04-02-0	)5(1)
I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	0
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	9
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	10
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	19
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$ 418